



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/671,957	09/27/2000	Inching Chen	ITL.1780US (P9234)	8316
21906	7590	01/26/2009	EXAMINER	
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C. 1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750 HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631				CZEKAJ, DAVID J
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2621		
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			01/26/2009	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte INCHING CHEN

Application 09/671,957
Technology Center 2600

Mailed: January 26, 2009

Before PAMELA S. BENNETT, *Review Team Paralegal.*

BENNETT, *Review Team Paralegal.*

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on September 22, 2008. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matters requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER'S ANSWER, EVIDENCE RELIED UPON

Section §1207.02 of the *Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* (MPEP) (Eighth Edition, Rev. 6, September 2007) states:

(A) CONTENT REQUIREMENTS FOR EXAMINER'S ANSWER. The examiner's answer is required to include, under appropriate headings, in the order indicated, the following items:

....

- (8) Evidence Relied Upon. A listing of the evidence relied on (e.g., patents, publications, admitted prior art), and in the case of nonpatent references, the relevant page or pages.

The Examiner's Answer mailed May 1, 2008 is deficient because the "Evidence Relied Upon" section fails to include the Krishnamurthy et al. reference cited on page 4 which involves the rejection of claims 7-9, 13 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Appropriate correction is required.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Appellants filed a paper entitled "Supplemental Response to Office Action" dated April 9, 2008. There is no indication on the record that the Examiner has considered the above-noted paper.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the application is returned to the Examiner:

- 1) to issue a PTO-90 citing the missing Krishnamurthy et al. reference listed under the Evidence Relied Upon section, paragraph (8);

2) to consider the “Supplemental Response to Office Action” dated April 9, 2008; and

3) for such further action as may be required.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

PSB

Trop Pruner & Hu, PC
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631